UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/620,433	07/17/2003	John W. Ludlow	320727.00201	1097

22428 7590 03/08/2007
FOLEY AND LARDNER LLP
SUITE 500
3000 K STREET NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20007

EXAMINER	
SINGH, ANOOP KUMAR	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
1632	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/08/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/620,433	LUDLOW ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Anoop Singh	1632	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *11/30/06*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-28 and 88-100* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-28,88-100* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *11/30/06* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

The Examiner prosecuting this application has been changed. Any inquiries relating to the examination of the application should be directed to Examiner Singh. The telephone number is provided at the end of this office action.

Applicant's amendment filed on November 13, 2006, has been received and entered. Claims 29-87 has been canceled, while claims 5, 8, 11, 12, 27 have been amended. Applicants have also added claims 88-100.

Claims 1-28 and 88-100 are pending in the instant application.

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election with traverse of group I, claims 1-28, in the reply filed on April 14, 2006 was acknowledged. The traversal was on the ground(s) that the office has not demonstrated that it would be a burden to examine claims 1-87 together. This was not found persuasive because the office has demonstrated that the various claims fall into patentably distinct groups as supported by their different classifications. Further, each of the groups would require a unique search and require a different consideration of the relevant art within the scope of the invention as stated in previous office action dated 7/13/2006.

Claims 1-28 and 88-100 are under consideration.

New-Objection-Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See MPEP § 608.01. See page 31, last para. and page 34. Appropriate correction is required.

New-Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 92-93 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. 37 CFR 1.118(a) states "No amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of an application after the filing date of the application". In the instant case, the recitation of limitation "... density of at least one band of lower density is less than 1.0792 (claim 92) or 1.0607 (claim 93) are considered new matter. Applicants do not point to the specification for the specific support of the claimed amendment reciting process of claim 1 in which density of band is 1.0792 or 1.0607. However, upon further review of the instant specification, examiner could not find support for the specific density recited in amended claims only in medium

comprising iodixanol (Optiprep)(see para. 48 of the published application). It is emphasized that instant support is directly to density of different bands after centrifugation of cells in a specific medium comprising iodixanol. The specification provides no link to show that these specific density bands could be obtained in cells centrifuged in any other centrifugation medium as broadly recited in claim 1.

MPEP 2163.06 notes "If new matter is added to the claims, the examiner should reject the claims under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph-written description requirement. *In re Rasmussen*, 650 F.2d 1212, 211 USPQ 323 (CCPA 1981) teaches that "Whenever the issue arises, the fundamental factual inquiry is whether a claim defines an invention that is clearly conveyed to those skilled in the art at the time application was filed...If a claim is amended to include subject matter, limitation or terminology not present in the application as filed, involving a departure from, addition to, or deletion from the disclosure of the application as filed, the examiner should conclude that the claimed subject matter is not described in that application. MPEP 2163.06 further notes, "When an amendment is filed in reply to an objection or rejection based on U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, a study of the entire application is often necessary to determine whether or not "new matter" is involved. Applicant should therefore specifically point out the support for any amendment made to the disclosure".

To the extent the claimed method are not described in the instant disclosure, claims 92-93 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to

make and/or use the invention, since the applicants disclosure do not teach a method that is adequately described in the specification. In this case, it appears that the claims reflect band density obtained from spinning the cells in any medium. A review of art would indicate that centrifugation of cells in different mediums as recited in claim 1 would not yield bands of lower density as recited in the claims 92 and 93. Simply providing, for what the most of the cells centrifuged in genus of medium have would constitute an enormous amount of experimentation to empirically test all these medium to determine if that separate bands of density of 1.0792 and 1.0607. As described before, the specification does not provide adequate guidance on determining what is included or excluded by the claims as amended and therefore an artisan of skill would require undue experimentation to practice or make and/or use the invention.

Withdrawn-Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 8 and 28 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention is withdrawn in view of amendment to the claims now replacing trade name with more generic product to describe the material.

Maintained-Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-7, 9-13, 15-21, 26, 27 remain provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by copending Application No. 09/764,359 (US patent application no: 2002/0039786; art of record) which has a common inventor with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the copending application, it would constitute prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), if published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b) or patented. The cited art teaches methods of isolating liver progenitor cells comprising methods of fractionation by density centrifugation in particular the use of percoll gradients for separation of cell populations from the liver, in particular for the isolation of liver stem cells from primates such as humans.

The applied reference has a common inventor with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

New-Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-2, 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tateno et al (EP 682106, dated 11/15/1995).

Tateno et al teach a method to obtain liver parenchymal cell having clonal growth ability that are considered to contain hepatic progenitor cells (see abstract and page 3, line 4-5). It is noted that method disclosed by Tateno et al embrace isolating hepatic cells from liver of adult mammal by the collagenase perfusion and percoll centrifugation (see table 1, page 7). Tateno et al describe presence of at least two fractions upon centrifugation. It is noted that Tateno et al also disclose isolating cells from the light fraction after centrifugation that is then cultured in a medium containing FBS and ascorbic acid (see table 1 and claim 6 and 7). It is emphasized that instant method claim do not exclude other method of isolating hepatic cells such as standard percoll based isolation method. Accordingly, method steps taught by Tateno et al are same as one recited in the instant claims. Accordingly, claims1-2, 6 are anticipated by Tateno et al.

Withdrawn-Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-10, 12-26 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 0 682 106 A2, Gale et al. (J Endocrinol 92(2): 293-302, Feb 1982), Singh et al.

(Acta Physiol Scand 117(4): 497-505, April 1983) is withdrawn in view of missing body of the rejection statement from the previous office action 7/13/2006.

Claims 1-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 0682 106 A2 in view of Grahm (Scientific World J 2:1347-50, May 2002).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-10, 12-17, 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tateno et al (EP 0682 106 A2, dated 04/11/1995), Singh et al Acta Physiol Scand 117(4): 497-505, April 1983, art of record) and Naughton et al (US Patent no. 5785964, dated 7/28/1998).

Tateno et al teach a method to obtain liver parenchymal cell having clonal growth ability that are considered to contain hepatic progenitor cells (see abstract and page 3, line 4-5). It is noted that method disclosed by Tateno et al embrace isolating hepatic cells from liver of adult mammal by the collagenase perfusion and percoll centrifugation (see table 1, page 7). Tateno et al describe presence of at least two fractions upon centrifugation. It is noted that Tateno et al also disclose isolating cells from the light fraction after centrifugation that is then cultured in a medium containing FBS and ascorbic acid (see table 1 and claim 6 and 7). Although, Tateno et al teach a method to isolated hepatic cell including progenitor cells and generally embraced the idea that liver

parenchymal cells have clonal growth and contains hepatic progenitor cells, which could be selected or enriched with specific markers, however, Tateno et al differed from claimed invention by not explicitly disclosing isolation of different nonparenchymal cells.

Prior to instant invention, Singh et al disclose a method to separates viable rat liver parenchymal cells from other cell populations present in crude suspensions of liver cells. Singh et al disclose fractionation of cells by centrifugation in a self-generated Percoll gradient (see abstract). It is noted that Singh et al disclosed that method could separate Kupffer cells from other sinusoidal cells, resulting in a separate peak of peroxidase negative non-parenchymal cells. However, Singh et al do not explicitly disclose use of mechanical dissociation of cells.

Naughton et al teach a method to culture a variety of different cells and tissues in vitro for prolonged periods (see abstract). Naughton et al teach that the tissue or organ could be disaggregated mechanically and/or treated with digestive enzymes and/or chelating agents to weaken the connections between neighboring cells enabling to disperse the tissue into a suspension of individual cells. Naughton et al also disclose that enzymatic dissociation could be accomplished by mincing the tissue and treating the minced tissue with any of a number of digestive enzymes including collagenase, elastase and/or hyaluronidase, DNase, pronase, dispase. Naughton et al contemplate various methods for mechanical disruption including using grinders, blenders, sieves, homogenizers, and pressure cells. Naughton et al also teach method comprising exposing the hepatic portal vein by dissection and then perfusing with collagenase solution separating the outer parenchyma and mincing the inner parenchyma in Hanks

balanced salt solution (HBSS). Naughton et al disclose centrifuging the cells through a Percoll gradient and separating liver parenchyma cells. Although, Naughton et al generally embraced the idea of separating nonparenchymal cell from liver using percoll centrifugation method, he did not contemplate using method for isolating hepatic progenitor cells.

Accordingly, in view of the teachings of Tateno, Singh and Naughton et al, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the claimed invention was made, to modify the method of dissociating cell from liver as disclosed by Tateno by mechanical dissociation or using other protease such as elastase with a reasonable expectation of success. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been sufficiently motivated to make such a modification since Naughton et al had successfully taught isolation of cells using mechanical dissociation and also emphasized the use of different protease for enzymatic. The artisan would be further motivated to use different method of dissociation in order to maximize the isolation of cell, particularly since both Tateno and Naughton et al sought to isolate hepatic cells using percoll gradient centrifugation. Therefore, given that other mechanical or enzymatic dissociation method were available for isolation of different hepatic cells as per the teachings of Naughton et al, it would have obvious for an artisan of ordinary skill to use Percoll gradient centrifugation by digesting liver with different protease or by mechanical dissociation as disclosed in the instant application.

One who would practiced the invention would have had reasonable expectation of success because Tateno, Singh and Naughton et al had already described the

method to isolate hepatic cells using Percoll density gradient centrifugation method. Thus, it would have only required routine experimentation to modify the method disclosed by Tateno to include other method to digest liver to isolate hepatic cells including progenitor cells as disclosed by instant invention.

Thus, the claimed invention, as a whole, is clearly *prima facie* obvious in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

Claims 1-6, 8, 11-17, 22-28, 88-100 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tateno et al (EP 0682 106 A2, dated 04/11/1995), Brill et al (Proc Soc Exp Biol Med. 1993; 204(3): 261-9), Cassiman et al (Am J Pathol. 1999; 155(6): 1831-9) and Graham (Scientific World J 2:1347-50, May 2002).

Tateno et al teach a method to obtain liver parenchymal cell having clonal growth ability that are considered to contain hepatic progenitor cells (see abstract and page 3, line 4-5). It is noted that method disclosed by Tateno et al embrace isolating hepatic cells from liver of adult mammal by the collagenase perfusion and percoll centrifugation (see table 1, page 7). Tateno et al describe presence of at least two fractions upon centrifugation. It is noted that Tateno et al also disclose isolating cells from the light fraction after centrifugation that is then cultured in a medium containing FBS and ascorbic acid (see table 1 and claim 6 and 7). Although, Tateno et al teach a method to isolated hepatic cell including progenitor cells and generally embraced the idea that liver parenchymal cells have clonal growth and contains hepatic progenitor cells, which could be selected or enriched with specific markers. However, Tateno et al differed from

claimed invention by not using Optiprep (iodixanol) for isolation and enrichment of smaller heaptocytes and cells of 7-12 microns.

Brill et al teach a method for identifying and isolating antigenically related cell populations present in normal tissues using monoclonal antibodies to oval cell antigens and fluorescence-activated cell sorting. It is noted that Brill et al disclose three cellular subpopulations that could be isolated including (i) committed progenitors to heaptocytes; (ii) committed progenitors to bile ducts; or (iii) a mixed population of hemopoietic cells that contained a small percentage of hepatic blasts that are possibly pluripotent. Brill et al also teach that the hepatic blasts are small (7-10 microns) cells that differentiate into cells with recognizable parenchymal cell fates (see abstract). Thus, any marker associated with progenitor cells of 7-10 micron is implicit in the teaching of Brill et al. It is noted that although Brill et al provided adequate guidance of presence of distinct population of hepatic cell including hepatic progenitor, he did not teach method to isolate small size cell using Optiprep (iodixanol) based gradient centrifugation method for isolation of cells.

Cassiman et al teach a method to isolate hepatic stellate cells of low density by collagenase/pronase digestion followed by density gradient centrifugation with iodixanol (Optiprep) It is noted that Cassiman et al disclose treating liver tissue with collagenase type IV (0.05% w/v) and digestion with Pronase E. Cassiman et al also teach isolation of cells at densities <1.053 (9% Optiprep) using the method incorporated by the reference of Alpini describing advances in isolation of liver cells. Cassiman et al differed from claimed invention by not disclosing isolation of hepatic cell includes progenitor cells.

Graham et al teach that majority of parenchymal cells from mammalian liver cells can be removed by very low speed centrifugation (50 g) but a simple low-density barrier (1.096 g/ml) is required to remove the remaining parenchymal cells from the supernatant which contains all of the lower density nonparenchymal cells. Graham et al disclose flotation through a low-density iodixanol barrier could provide a satisfactory enrichment of the least dense nonparenchymal cell and the stellate cells. It is noted that Graham disclose that low density nonparenchymal cell could be isolate or enriched using low-density iodixanol (optiprep) barrier, however, Graham et al do not teach the method steps to isolate cells.

Accordingly, in view of the teachings of Tateno, Brill, Cassiman and Graham, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the claimed invention was made, to modify the method of obtaining hepatic cells by replacing the percoll based cell separation medium with a iodixanol (optiprep) barrier based density gradient with a reasonable expectation of success. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been sufficiently motivated to make such a modification, as Brill had already disclosed the presence of mixed cellular subpopulations that could be isolated separately including committed progenitors to hepatocytes; committed progenitors to bile ducts; or a mixed population of hemopoietic cells. The artisan would be further motivated to use flotation of cells through a low-density iodixanol barrier to provide satisfactory enrichment of the least dense nonparenchymal cell and the stellate cells as taught by Graham, particularly since the hepatic blasts are only 7-10 microns (supra) and both Tateno and Graham et al sought to isolate hepatic cells. Thus, any marker

such as one CD133 or EP-CAM associated with cells of 7-10 micron size derived from liver is implicit in the teaching. Although Tateno et al did not use low-density iodixanol barrier, he generally embraced potential of density based separation method for the isolation of hepatic cell including progenitor cells. In addition, Tateno et al and Brill provided motivation of using other separation method by suggesting presence of hepatic progenitor cell of smaller size. Therefore, given that low-density iodixanol barrier based gradient centrifugation method were available for isolation of different hepatic cells as per the teachings of Cassiman et al and Graham et al, it would have obvious for an artisan of ordinary skill to use iodixanol based density gradient centrifugation method to isolate hepatic cell including progenitor cells as disclosed in the instant application.

One who would practiced the invention would have had reasonable expectation of success because Tateno, Cassiman and Graham had already described the method to isolate hepatic cells using density gradient centrifugation method. Tateno and Brill, had already described the presence of low density nonparenchymal cell, while Graham et al suggested that low density low density nonparenchymal cell could be enriched using iodixanol based method. Thus, it would have only required routine experimentation to modify the method disclosed by Tateno to include with a iodixanol (optiprep) based method to isolate hepatic cells including progenitor cells as disclosed by instant invention.

The limitation of claims 13-17 and 90-91 and 98-100 are included in the instant rejection since these buffer comprising RPMI-1640 medium with 10% human or bovine

serum, or filtering step, centrifugation speed and machine, collection bags as required by the claims are obvious variations of the medium, filtration speed, machine and collection bags disclosed by cited arts. It is emphasized that in absence of any unexpected result an artisan of ordinary skill would have been sufficiently aware of the different analogous medium in presence or absence of phenol red or centrifugation machine and relative g force depending upon the rotor radius.

Thus, the claimed invention, as a whole, is clearly *prima facie* obvious in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

Claims 1-17, 22-28, 88-100 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tateno et al (EP 0682 106 A2, dated 04/11/1995), Brill et al (Proc Soc Exp Biol Med. 1993; 204(3): 261-9), Cassiman et al (Am J Pathol. 1999; 155(6): 1831-9), Graham (Scientific World J 2:1347-50, May 2002) and Naughton et al (US Patent no. 5785964, dated 7/28/1998).

The combined teaching Tateno et al, Brill et al, Cassiman et al and Graham have been discussed above and relied in same manner here. However, none of the references teaches mechanical dissociation or use of different protease.

Prior to filing of this application, Naughton et al teach that cells have been routinely harvested from tissue or organ by mechanically dissociation and/or treatment with digestive enzymes and/or chelating agents to weaken the connections between neighboring cells enabling to disperse the tissue into a suspension of individual cells. Naughton et al also disclose that enzymatic dissociation could be accomplished by

mincing the tissue and treating the minced tissue with any of a number of digestive enzymes including elastase and/or pronase. However, Naughton et al do not specifically teach isolation of cells using iodixanol (optiprep) based method.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious and within the scope of one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the method of obtaining cells enriched in viable human hepatic cells taught by Tateno et al, Brill et al, Cassiman et al and Graham et al to by using other method to dissociate cells from the liver as disclosed by Naughton et al.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to mice or mechanically dissociate or use other protease to obtain population of hepatic cell particularly since Naughton et al had already disclosed that these could be used in conjunction with collagenase in order to obtain cells derived from liver.

The limitation of claims 13-17 and 90-91 and 98-100 are included in the instant rejection since these buffer comprising RPMI-1640 medium with 10% human or bovine serum, or filtering step, centrifugation speed and machine, collection bags as required by the claims are obvious variations of the medium, filtration speed, machine and collection bags disclosed by cited arts. It is emphasized that in absence of any unexpected result an artisan of ordinary skill would have been sufficiently aware of the different analogous medium in presence or absence of phenol red or centrifugation machine and relative g force depending upon the rotor radius.

Therefore, the claimed invention would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

Claims 1-28, 88-100 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tateno et al (EP 0682 106 A2, dated 04/11/1995), Brill et al (Proc Soc Exp Biol Med. 1993; 204(3): 261-9), Cassiman et al (Am J Pathol. 1999; 155(6): 1831-9), Graham (Scientific World J 2:1347-50, May 2002) and further in view of Dementrious et al (US patent no. 6,140123, dated 10/ 31/ 2000, effective filing date 10/7/1998).

The combined teaching Tateno et al, Brill et al, Cassiman et al and Graham have been discussed above and relied in same manner here. However, none of the references teaches that the cells that are subjected to cryopreservation.

Prior to filing of this application, Demetriou et al teach that cells have been routinely harvested and preserved in scientific research and development. It is also noted that Demetriou et al teach that cell could be re-used after thawing and placing in a cell culture medium. Demetriou et al also disclose storage medium for cryopreservation (col. 1-2) including cryopreservation buffer comprising serum and DMSO (See entire col. 6 and 7). However, Demetriou et al do not specifically teach cryopreservation of hepatic cells.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious and within the scope of one of ordinary skill in the art to subject the method of cultured cells taught by Tateno et al, Brill et al, Cassiman et al and Graham et al to cryopreserve as taught by Demetriou et al.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to cryopreserve expanded hepatic cells including progenitor cells for future analysis or use as described by Demetriou et al.

Therefore, the claimed invention would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

Maintained-Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-28 remain provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 3, 4, 6-9, 12-21, 23-34 of copending Application No. 09/764,359 (published as 2002/0039786 A1). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because each comprise methods of isolating liver progenitor cells comprising methods of fractionation by density centrifugation (compare claim 1 of the instant application with dependent claims 29 and 30 for example). It is noted that the set of claims do not recite each of the specific limitations in each case, however given the

guidance of the two disclosures, the use of percoll gradients for separation of cell populations from the liver, in particular for the isolation of liver stem cells from primates such as humans, the two sets of claims would be obvious over each other.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-28 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. It is emphasized that although the conflicting claims are not exactly the same, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both sets of claims encompass a method to separate cell population from the liver. Certain of the instant broader claims differ only with respect gradient medium that could be used for isolation of liver stem cell. A Terminal disclaimer would obviate this rejection. This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Conclusion

No Claims allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anoop Singh whose telephone number is (571) 272-3306. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00AM-5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Paras can be reached on (571) 272- 4517. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Anoop Singh
Au 1632

Anne-Marie Falk

ANNE-MARIE FALK, PH.D
PRIMARY EXAMINER